REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **14 November 2005**, the Examiner reviewed claims 1-34. Claims 1-5, 7-16, and 18-34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Datta (USPub 2003/0004998, hereinafter "Datta"). Claims 6 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Datta, in view of Ims et al. (USPub 2004/0162886, hereinafter "Ims").

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) and 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Independent claims 1, 11, 12, 23, 24, and 32 were rejected as being anticipated by Datta. Applicant respectfully points out that Datta teaches using a "set" command or a "get" command to **specify the source of data** to put into a response to a request (see Datta, page 13, paragraphs [0144]-[0145]). A "get" command indicates that the cache includes the data, while the "set" command indicates that the content can be inserted into the template.

In contrast, the present invention **includes a content invalidation message** to a downstream cache along with a data response, whether or not the content invalidation message refers to the data response (see page 11, line 21 to page 12, line 10 of the instant application). In other words, the invalidation message is piggy-backed onto a possibly unrelated response. This is beneficial because it allows the downstream cache to be notified of content invalidation without the necessity of maintaining a separate communication connection to perform this notification. There is nothing within Datta or Cuomo, either separately or in concert, which suggests including a content invalidation message to a downstream cache along with a data response, whether or not the content invalidation message refers to the data response.

Accordingly, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 11, 12, 23, 24, and 32 to clarify that the present invention includes a content invalidation

message to a downstream cache along with a data response, whether or not the content invalidation message refers to the data response. These amendments find support on page 11, line 21 to page 12, line 10 of the instant application.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 11, 12, 23, 24, and 32 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 2-10, which depend upon claim 1, claims 13-22, which depend upon claim 12, claims 25-31, which depend upon claim 24, and claims 33-34, which depend upon claim 32, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By   _Edward J. Grundler_
Edward J. Grundler
Registration No. 47,615

Date: 10 January 2006

Edward J. Grundler
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
2820 Fifth Street
Davis, CA 95616-7759
Tel: (530) 759-1663
FAX: (530) 759-1665
Email: edward@parklegal.com

11